



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,532	06/24/2005	Paul Geoffrey Tindall	TTP510621	3549
20280	7590	08/25/2008		
MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 W4 - 39Q LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343				
EXAMINER				
AFOLAB, MARK O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4122				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/25/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM

ADB035@Motorola.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/540,532

**Applicant(s)**

TINDALL, PAUL GEOFFREY

**Examiner**

MARK O. AFOLABI

**Art Unit**

4122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2003.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/09/2008  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is in response to application No. 10/540,532 filed on 10/06/2003, claims 1-13 have been examined.

### ***Specification***

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The specification is objected to for failing to follow proper format or content arrangement as specified above. The proper format of the specification is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Lefebvre et al. (US 2002/0046299) (Lefebvre hereafter) and Emens et. al (US 6,493,744) (Emens hereafter)

Regarding claim 1, a method of filtering text messages, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) inputting a rule set [user limit values] into the telecommunications device by downloading the rules set from a network operator;
- b) reading an incoming message;
- c) modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set; and
- d) displaying the modified message

wherein the rule comprises a plurality of rules, each of which relates to a respective predetermined message content.

Lefebvre teaches a method of filtering text messages [internal server 112b filters the data to search for events of interest, and 0057] received by a mobile telecommunications device (Fig. 4—item 405, Lefebvre),

downloading the rules set [the user could ...download information pertaining to alert and priority rules that have been set with the network, 0083] from a network operator ([central network, 0032]). Lefeber also teaches reading an incoming message [0074], wherein when the rule set comprises a plurality of rules, each of which relates to a respective predetermined message ([0040]).

Lefeber does not explicitly teach modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set and displaying the modified message.

However, Emens teaches modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set (Fig. 2B); and displaying the modified message (Fig. 2B—item 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made, given the suggestions of Lefeber and Emens to filter text messages received by a mobile telecommunications device, inputting a rule set into the telecommunications device by downloading the rules set from a network operator by reading an incoming message, modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set and displaying the modified message.

One would be motivated to utilize a mobile phone or other user interfaces which are capable of function activation, such as keypad, voice activation, joysticks, touch screens, dial shuttles as input means in any mobile communication with a display.

Regarding claim 2, wherein the message is a text message (Figs. 2A - 2C, Emens).

Regarding claim 3, wherein step b) includes the step of parsing the incoming test message (Fig. 3, Emens).

Regarding claim 4, wherein step c) is such as to delete the predetermined text content, or to replace the letters of the predetermined text content (Fig. 2C, Emens) with meaningless characters (col. 4, lines 4-7 and col. 5, lines 55-58, Emens).

Regarding claim 5, wherein step

a) is carried out by downloading the rule set from a network operator [network] ([the user could ...download information pertaining to alert and priority rules that have been set with the network, 0083])

Regarding claim 6, comprises substantially the same limitations as those address in claim 1. Therefore, the same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 7. A telecommunications device comprising a transceiver, a processor and a display, the processor including software, means [Fig. 3—item 336 and 0059, Lefebvre] for inputting a rule set into the software from a network operator, means (Fig. 4C—item 110, Emens) for reading an incoming message [0074, Lefebvre], means (Fig. 4B—item 100, Emens) for modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set (Fig. 4B—item 104, Emens) whereby a modified message is displayed (Fig. 2B—item 36), wherein the rule set comprises a plurality of rules, each of which relates to a respective predetermined message content (Fig. 2C, Emens and 0040, Lefebvre).

Regarding claim 8, wherein the software [Recreation Software Advisory Council (RSAC)] is such that a user (e.g. parent) of the device can modify the rule set (col. 7, lines 1-13, Emens).

Regarding claim 9, further comprising data input means linked to the processor for modifying the rule set (col. 9, lines 35-43, Emens).

Regarding claim 10, wherein a keypad constitutes the data input means [0008, Lefebvre]

Regarding claim 11, wherein, when the message is a text message (Fig. 3—item 58, Emens), the software is such as to parse (Fig. 3—item 60, Emens) the incoming text message (Fig. 2A, Emens) .

Regarding claim 12, comprises substantially the same limitations as those address in claim 4. Therefore, the same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 13, A mobile telecommunications device comprising a transceiver, a processor and a display (Fig. 4A—item 84, Emens), the processor including software containing a rule set means [Fig. 3—item 336 and 0059, Lefebvre] means (Fig. 4A—item 82, Emens) for modifying the rule set, to accommodate the needs of a user, on input of a modification of the rule set by that user, means (Fig. 4A—item 84, Emens) for reading an incoming message, means (Fig. 4A—item 76, Emens) for modifying the message if that message breaks a rule of the rule set whereby a modified message is displayed, wherein the rule set comprises a plurality of rules, each of which relates to a respective predetermined message content (Fig. 2C, Emens and 0040, Lefebvre).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK O. AFOLABI whose telephone number is (571) 270-5627. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached on 571-272-3902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M.O.A/  
/Mark O. Afolabi/  
Examiner GAU 4122

/ASHOK PATEL/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154